

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are responsive to the points raised in the November 2, 2005 non-final Office Action. Upon entry of the above amendments, Claims 11 and 13 will have been amended, Claims 1-10 and 15 will have been withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention, new Claims 24-26 will have been added, and Claims 1-26 will be pending. No new matter has been introduced. Entry and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Specification

The amendments to the specification correct the spelling of the following three original terms of “fibre”, “metre”, “millimetre”, and “diopetre” used in the specification. Correction of these terms is consistent with the amendments to Claim 13 in response to the Examiner’s objection.

Response to the Objection of Claim 13

The Examiner has objected to Claim 13 on the basis of the term “fibre”, which the Examiner regards as informal.

Applicant has amended Claim 13 to change the term “fibre”, both occurrences, to the term “fiber” to thereby obviate this objection.

Accordingly, the objection to Claim 13 is now moot and should be withdrawn.

Response to the Rejection Under 35 § U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, and 20-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over US Patent 4,958,816 to Seko et al. (Seko). Claims 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,844,733 to Malhi (Malhi). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Independent Claim 11 has been amended to recite a main beam headlight for a vehicle including, inter alia:

“wherein said electronic system comprises means for detecting in a road scene at least one person and means for generating said mask on the imager according to the detection of said at least one person.”

The present invention detects at least one person in a road scene via a means of the electronic system, which also includes a means for generating a mask on the image in accordance to the detection of the at least one person. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Seko nor Malhi teach or suggest the invention as recited in Claims 11-14 and 16-23.

In contrast, Seko discloses that a CCD camera 23 shoots a headlamp beam projected from an approaching vehicle. Both the CCD image memory 24 has picture elements that, respectfully, corresponds to a liquid crystal matrix 15. The image signals from the image memory 24 are treated by a microcomputer 29 and reversed in signal intensity by an image reversing circuit 25 and applied to a drive circuit 20 that causes the liquid crystal matrix 15 to produce a pattern including a shallow portion at the area that corresponds to the approaching vehicle position. Thus, the driver of the approaching vehicle is prevented from a blinding phenomenon. Malhi discloses a portable computing

device (computer notebook) having a light source in the base including a liquid crystal display 50.

No where is it seen where Seko or Malhi teach or suggest a main beam headlight for a vehicle having an electronic system including a means for detecting at least one person in a road scene and a means for generating a mask on an liquid crystal matrix\display in accordance with the detection of the at least one person by the means for detecting. Neither Seko not Smith, either alone or in combination, advance and teaching or suggestion that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the disclosure of Seko, as advanced by the Examiner, and arrive at the a main beam headlight for a vehicle as recited in independent Claim 11. As such, the subject matter of amended Claim 11 is distinguished over the disclosure of Seko and/or Malhi.

Newly added Claims 24-26 are directed to a main beam headlight for a vehicle including (1) a light guide, disposed between the light source and the imager, for transporting the light and reducing infrared radiation from the light source to the image as recited in Claim 24, (2) a light guide including at least one optical fiber for transporting the light from the light source to the image as recited in Claim 25, and (3) wherein the light source is a discharge lamp.

Seko teaches the use of a heat reflecting filter 16 located behind the second focus f_2 to prevent heat transfer from the light bulb 12 to the liquid crystal matrix 15. No where is it seen where Seko teaches or suggests a light guide as recited in newly added Claims 24 and 25 and/or a discharge lamp as the light source. The portable computing device taught by Malhi utilizes a light source 85 and a parallel light guide 80 that captures the

Amendment

mitted light and distributes it evenly across its surface. No where is it seen where Malhi teaches or suggests that a light guide as recited in newly added Claims 24 and 25 and/or a discharge lamp as the light source. Further more, does not advance any teaching or suggestion that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teaching of Seko and arrive at the a main beam headlight for a vehicle recited in newly added Claims 24-26.

Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Response to the Rejections Under 35 § U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seko in view of US patent 6,281,806 to Smith et al. (Smith). Applicants traverse this rejection.

For at least the reasons discussed above, dependent Claims 18 and 19 are distinguished over Seko for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to Claim 11, in addition to the difference identified by the Examiner. Applicant, nonetheless, respectfully submits that Smith does not include any teaching, suggestion, or motivation that would teach, suggest, or motivate, one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the vehicle headlamp of Seko, as suggested by the Examiner, so that the electronic system thereof includes a means for detecting at least one person in a road scene and a means for generating a mask on an liquid crystal matrix in accordance with the detection of the at least one person by the means for detecting. As such, the subject matter recited in dependent Claims 18 and 19 are distinguished over the prior art teachings of Seko and Smith, either alone or in combination.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.


AUTHORIZATIONS

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the timely consideration of this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1948-4835.

Date: January 18, 2006

By:

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.



Brian W. Brown

Reg. No.: 47,265

(202) 857-7887 Telephone

(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:
Morgan & Finnegan, L.L.P.
Three World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 Telephone
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile